



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/809,668 | 03/15/2001 | Yasuhiro Terayama | 7217/64043 | 5414 |

7590

07/28/2004

JAY H. MAIOLI
Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER

LE, MIRANDA

ART UNIT

2177

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

56

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/809,668

Applicant(s)

TERAYAMA ET AL.

Examiner

Miranda Le

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/13/2004 has been entered.
2. This communication is responsive to Amendment B, filed 04/19/2004.
3. Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 22, 24 are independent claims. In the Amendment B, claims 1, 12, 22, 24 have been amended. This action is made non-Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2177

5. Claims 1-10, 12-19, 22-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lektion et al. (US Patent No. 6,765,596 B2), in view of Sorge et al. (US Patent No. 6,691,281 B1).

As per claim 1, Lektion teaches “a step of determining whether the data indicated by the detected identifier is displayable on the limited-capability device” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 2;

“a step of displaying the extracted data for display the data to be shaped for the limited capability device” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28;

“a step of shaping, based on the determined characteristic, the extracted data for display on the limited capability device” at col. 6, line 30 to col. 7, line 14.

Lektion does not expressly teach the following claimed limitations. However, Sorge teaches:

“a step of determining what characteristic of the first file is to be converted” at col. 3, line 63 to col. 4, line 21, col. 7, lines 19-21;

“a step of detecting the identifier by reading the file” at col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 37, col. 10, lines 17-44;

“a step of extracting the data, the start and the end of which are indicated by the determined identifier and which is determined to be displayable on the limited-capability device” at col. 8, line 45 to col. 9, line 5, col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 37;

“a step of outputting an output file which is newly created from the extracted data that has been shaped, as a different file from the first file” at col. 12, line 41 to col. 13, line 40.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lektion with the teachings of Sorge to include “a step of determining..., a step of detecting the identifier..., a step of extracting the data..., a step of outputting an output file...” in order to provide a method for exporting data into hypertext markup language (HTML) documents, and for updating a previously exported discreet data section in an HTML document, without changing any other section of the HTML document; and while ensuring that such data can be imported from the HTML document back into a source application with all the formatting unique to the source application intact.

As per claim 12, Lektion teaches “detector means for detecting the identifier corresponding to the selected characteristic which indicates the data displayable on a limited-capability device from the file stored in said first file storage means” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28;

“control means for controlling the detector means to detect the identifier indicating the start and the end of the displayable data for the purpose of extracting the data displayable on the limited-capability device from said first file stored in said file storage means” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 2,

“for controlling said extractor means to extract, as a new output file with the selected characteristic having been converted, data including the start and the end indicated by the identifier from said first file, and for controlling said output means to output the new output file to the limited-capability device” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28, col. 6, line 30 to col. 7, line 14;

Art Unit: 2177

“output means for outputting the extracted data to the limited-capability device, whereby the limited-capability device displays on a screen thereof one of the map, the coupon and the address information” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28, Fig. 1;

“wherein the extracted data is one of a map, a coupon, and address information” in Fig. 1.

Lecton does not explicitly teach the following claimed limitations, but Sorge teaches:

“extractor means for extracting, from said first file, the data with the start and the end thereof indicated, in accordance with the identifier detected by the detector means” at col. 8, line 45 to col. 9, line 5;

“means for selecting a characteristic of the first file that is to be converted” at col. 3, line 63 to col. 4, line 21, col. 7, lines 19-62;

“file storage means for storing the file” at col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 37.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lecton with the teachings of Sorge to include “extractor means for extracting, from said first file, the data with the start and the end thereof indicated, in accordance with the identifier detected by the detector means; means for selecting a characteristic of the first file that is to be converted; and file storage means for storing the file” in order to provide a method for exporting data into hypertext markup language (HTML) documents, and for updating a previously exported discreet data section in an HTML document, without changing any other section of the HTML document while ensuring that such data can be imported from the HTML document back into a source application with all the formatting unique to the source application intact.

As per claim 22, Lektion teaches “a step of detecting the identifier indicating the start of the data in the file, based on a rule for processing the data in the file into a data format displayable on the limited capability device, when the data is from the file and is stored in the first data buffer” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28;

“a step of detecting the identifier indicating the end of the data in response to the identifier indicating the end of the detected data” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28;

“a step of displaying the data stored in the first buffer to be shaped for the limited capability device” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28;

“a step of shaping, based on the determined characteristic, the displayed data for display on the limited-capability device” at col. 6, line 30 to col. 7, line 14.

Lektion does not specifically teach the following claimed limitations. However, Sorge teaches:

“a step of determining what characteristic of the first file is to be converted” at col. 3, line 63 to col. 4, line 21, col. 7, lines 19-62;

“a step of initializing a first data buffer for buffering data when a plurality of pieces of data is read from the file” at col. 8, line 45 to col. 9, line 5;

“a step of holding the data in the file, from the start thereof, into the first data buffer, based on the identifier indicating the start of the detected data” at col. 8, line 45 to col. 9, line 5, col. 9, line 52 to col. 10, line 44;

“a step of moving the data stored in the first data buffer to a second data buffer for evacuation; and a step of moving the data evacuated into the second data buffer to the first data buffer for restoration” at col. 8, line 45 to col. 9, line 5, col. 9, line 52 to col. 10, line 44.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lektion with the teachings of Sorge to include “a step of determining..., a step of initializing..., a step of holding..., a step of moving...” in order to provide a method for exporting data into hypertext markup language (HTML) documents, and for updating a previously exported discreet data section in an HTML document, without changing any other section of the HTML document while ensuring that such data can be imported from the HTML document back into a source application with all the formatting unique to the source application intact.

As per claim 24, Lektion teaches “a detector means for detecting an identifier which indicates the data, which is processable by the second apparatus, from the file stored in the storage means” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28;

“control means for controlling the storage means to store the file input thereto in the storage means, for controlling the detector means to detect the identifier that indicates, from the file stored in the storage means, data that can be processed to be processable by the second apparatus” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28,

“for controlling the extractor means to extract the data that is processed by the processing means in accordance with the identifier detected by the detector means, and for controlling the output means to output the data that has been processed by the processing means based on the selected characteristic” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28, col. 6, line 30 to col. 7, line 14;

“the extracted data is one of a map, a coupon, and address information” in Fig. 1 (i.e. People Search-119);

“wherein the second apparatus comprises: a receiver means for receiving the data output by the first apparatus” at col. 4, line 58 to col. 5, line 29;

“a display means for displaying the data received by the receiver means” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28.

Lecture does not expressly teach the following claimed limitations. However, Sorge teaches:

“an extractor means for extracting, from the input file, the data which is detected by the detector means and is processed into data processable by the second apparatus” at col. 5, line 44, to col. 6, line 37, col. 8, line 45 to col. 9, line 5;

“means for selecting a characteristic of the first file that is to be converted” at col. 7, lines 19-62, col. 3, line 63 to col. 4, line 21;

“a storage means for: storing the file input thereto” at col. 14, line 42 to col. 15, line 28, col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 37;

“a processing means for processing the extracted data into the data that is processable by the second apparatus” at col. 14, line 42 to col. 15, line 28, col. 12, line 41 to col. 13, line 39;

“an output means for outputting the data, which has been processed to be processable by the second apparatus, to the second apparatus” at col. 12, line 41 to col. 13, line 39.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lecture with the teachings of Sorge to include “means for selecting..., storage means..., processing means..., an output means...” in order to provide a

Art Unit: 2177

method for exporting data into hypertext markup language (HTML) documents, and for updating a previously exported discreet data section in an HTML document, without changing any other section of the HTML document while ensuring that such data can be imported from the HTML document back into a source application with all the formatting unique to the source application intact.

As per claim 2, Lektion teaches “the step of extracting the data is performed by referencing a conversion definition file that defines the identifier of the data that is displayable on the limited-capability device” at col. 3, line 58 to col. 4, line 28.

Sorge teaches this limitation at col. 12, line 41 to col. 13, line 39.

As per claim 3, Lektion teaches “the conversion definition file includes a rule for converting an image data file, and wherein the file conversion method comprises a step of outputting, to the limited-capability device, the image data file which has been converted based on the conversion rule of the image data file” at col. 3, line 58 to col. 4, line 28.

Sorge teaches this limitation at col. 12, line 41 to col. 13, line 39, col. 5, lines 28-44.

As per claim 4, Lektion teaches “the conversion definition file includes information of an image size displayable on the limited-capability device” at col. 6, lines 16-47.

Sorge teaches this limitation at col. 5, lines 28-44.

As per claim 5, Sorge teaches “the file comprises category information, and wherein the file conversion method comprises a step of selecting the conversion definition file to be used,

based on the category information of the file among a plurality of conversion definition files” at col. 5, lines 16-44.

As per claim 6, Lektion teaches “a file name of a file output as a new file uses a symbol string indicated by the predetermined identifier” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28.

Sorge teaches this limitation at col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 21.

As per claim 7, Lektion teaches “a step of selecting a file to be output to the limited-capability device from among the extracted data in response to an instruction from a user” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28.

Sorge teaches this limitation at col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 21.

As per claim 8, Sorge teaches “a step of acquiring the first file through a communication network from a data storage apparatus” at col. 15, line 29 to col. 16, line 22.

As per claim 9, Sorge teaches “the step of extracting the data comprises initializing a data buffer” at col. 8, line 45 to col. 9, line 5,

“and buffering in the data buffer the data included in the first file, the start and the end of which are indicated by the detected identifiers” at col. 8, line 45 to col. 9, line 5.

As per claim 10, Lektion teaches “the outputting of the data, the start and the end of which are indicated by the identifiers, to the limited-capability device is restricted in accordance with the identifiers” at col. 6, line 30 to col. 7, line 14.

Sorge teaches this limitation at col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 67, col. 8, line 45 to col. 9, line 5.

As per claim 13, Lektion teaches "an extracted data storage means for storing the extracted data as candidate data to be output to the limited-capability device" at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28.

Sorge teaches this limitation at col. 12, line 41 to col. 13, line 39.

As per claim 14, Lektion teaches "the data converter selectively outputs the data from among data stored in said extracted data storage means to the limited capability device in response to an instruction of a user" at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28.

Sorge teaches this limitation at col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 21.

As per claim 15, Lektion teaches "an image converter means for converting an image file indicated by said first file into data displayable on the limited-capability device" at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28.

Sorge teaches this limitation at col. 5, lines 28-44, col. 12, line 41 to col. 13, line 39.

As per claim 16, Lektion teaches "a rule file storage means for storing a conversion rule file for converting said image file into an image file displayable on the limited-capability device, wherein said image converter means performs image conversion based on data indicating a

screen size of the limited-capability device included in said conversion rule file" at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28.

Sorge teaches this limitation at col. 5, lines 28-44, col. 12, line 41 to col. 13, line 39.

As per claim 17, Lektion teaches "a display data output means for converting said first file into a data format displayable on the limited-capability device for displaying said first file, wherein the data converter acquires a file which is converted to be output to the limited-capability device from a file buffer means which buffers at least one file of the display data output means" at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 28.

Sorge teaches this limitation at col. 5, lines 28-44, col. 12, line 41 to col. 13, line 39, col. 8, line 45 to col. 9, line 5.

As per claim 18, Lektion teaches "a data communication means for acquiring the file through a communication network" at col. 10, lines 38-49.

Sorge teaches this limitation at col. 15, line 29 to col. 16, line 22.

As per claim 19, Lektion teaches "the data converter restricts, to the limited-capability device, the outputting of data not displayable on the limited-capability device, from among data from the start to the end indicated by the extracted identifier" at col. 6, line 30 to col. 7, line 14.

Sorge teaches this limitation at col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 67.

As per claim 23, Sorge teaches "a step of storing, in a storage means, data from the first data buffer as data to be processed" at col. 8, line 45 to col. 9, line 5;

“a step of moving the data evacuated into the second data buffer to the first data buffer for restoration” at col. 9, line 52 to col. 10, line 44.

As per claim 25, Lektion teaches “the first apparatus further comprises a receiver means, and wherein the receiver means receives the file from a file server connected to the receiver means via a network” at col. 4, line 58 to col. 5, line 29.

Sorge teaches this limitation at col. 14, line 42 to col. 15, line 28.

As per claim 26, Sorge teaches “a buffer means for buffering the data extracted from the file by the control means, and wherein the control means controls the buffer means to buffer the extracted data while processing the data buffered in the buffer means” at col. 8, line 45 to col. 9, line 5.

As per claim 27, Sorge teaches “the first apparatus further comprises an operation means operated by a user” at col. 14, line 42 to col. 15, line 28,

“and wherein the control means outputs the data, designated on the operation means by the user, to the second apparatus” at col. 14, line 42 to col. 15, line 28.

As per claim 28, Sorge teaches “an operation means operated by a user” at col. 14, line 42 to col. 15, line 28;

“and a storage means for storing the data received by the receiver means” at col. 6, line 39 to col. 7, line 18, col. 14, line 42 to col. 15, line 28,

wherein the data designated on the operation means by the user is read from the storage means and is displayed on the display means” at col. 10, lines 17-44, col. 14, line 42 to col. 15, line 28.

As to claims 29-32, Sorge teaches “the step of determining what characteristic determines one of an image size and a file format and a character count” at col. 7, lines 19-62.

6. Claims 11, 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lektion et al. (US Patent No. 6,765,596 B2), in view of Sorge et al. (US Patent No. 6,691,281 B1), and further in view of Serbinis et al. (US Patent No. 6,584,466 B1).

As per claim 11, Lektion teaches “the start and the end of which are indicated by the identifiers, is indicated by the identifiers” at col. 3, line 35 to col. 4, line 2; Sorge also teaches this limitation at col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 67. However, Lektion, Sorge does not specifically teach “the expiration date of the data”. However, Serbinis teaches this limitation at col. 9, lines 21-33.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lektion, Sorge with the teachings of Serbinis to include “the expiration date of the data” in order to provide users a plurality of document management services, including document storage and retrieval, collaborative file sharing and workflow services for electronic documents, an electronic document delivery service, and a document distribution service.

As per claim 20, although Lektion, Sorge do not explicitly teach “an expiration date extractor means for extracting, from the identifier, expiration date data indicating the expiration date of the data extracted by the identifier; and an expiration date determination means for determining the expiration date of the extracted data based on the expiration date of the extracted data”, Serbinis teaches this limitation at col. 9, lines 21-33.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lektion, Sorge with the teachings of Serbinis to include “an expiration date extractor means for extracting, from the identifier, expiration date data indicating the expiration date of the data extracted by the identifier; and an expiration date determination means for determining the expiration date of the extracted data based on the expiration date of the extracted data” in order to provide users a plurality of document management services, including document storage and retrieval, collaborative file sharing and workflow services for electronic documents, an electronic document delivery service, and a document distribution service.

As per claim 21, Lektion, Sorge do not specifically teach “a data renewal means for renewing the expiration date of the extracted data when it is determined that the extracted data has expired”. Serbinis, however, teaches this limitation at col. 9, lines 21-33.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Lektion, Sorge with the teachings of Serbinis to include “a data renewal means for renewing the expiration date of the extracted data when it is determined that the extracted data has expired” in order to provide a system that enable detailed accounting of transactions occurring on the system, and a customization function that permits multiple service

providers to utilize the common document management services of a server, while presenting end-user with distinct dedicated websites.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments regarding the cited references do not teach the amended limitations such as "a step of determining what characteristic of the first file is to be converted" and "a step of shaping, based on the determined characteristic, the extracted data for display on the limited capability device" with respect to claims 1, 12, 22, 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-3203. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax number to this Art Unit is (703) 746-7238. The TC 2100's Customer Service number is (703) 306-5631.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Miranda Le
July 23, 2003



GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER